

### **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed **August 25, 2003**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-50. The claims were subject to an election of species. Examiner received a verbal election of the species comprising claims 1-18. Claims 19-50 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 3-5, 10-12, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foody et al. (USPN 5,732,270, hereinafter "Foody") in view of Broussard (USPub 2003/0110024, hereinafter "Broussard"). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foody and Broussard and further in view of Hunt (USPub 2003/0056195, hereinafter "Hunt"). Claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foody and Broussard and further in view of Collazo (USPub 2002/0152304, hereinafter "Collazo"). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foody and Broussard and further in view of Munakata (USPN 5,717,917, hereinafter "Munakata").

### **Election of Species**

The claims were subject to an election of species. Examiner received a verbal election of the species comprising claims 1-18.

Applicant confirms the election of the species comprising claims 1-18. Claims 19-50 have been canceled without prejudice.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant respectfully points out that bi-directional relationships are comprised of multiple uni-directional peer relationships (see page 16, lines 23-32 of the instant application). Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 6 to clarify that the bi-directional relationship is comprised of the combination of uni-directional peer relationships. These amendments find support on page 16, lines 23-32 of the instant application.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Independent claim 1 was rejected as being unpatentable over Foody in view of Broussard. Applicant respectfully points out that Foody teaches creating proxy object 100 for a remotely located real object 103 (see Foody, FIG. 1).

In contrast, the instant invention discloses creating a proxy object to represent bi-directional relationships between a host object to which the proxy object belongs and peer objects with which the host object relates with a bi-directional relationship (see page 9, lines 15-17 of the instant application. A proxy object that represents a bi-directional relationship for a host object is not the same as a proxy object that represents a remote object. Note in FIG. 4 of the instant application that the host object is still remaining.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the present invention creates a proxy object to represent bidirectional relationships between a host object to which the proxy object belongs and peer objects with which the host object relates with a bi-directional relationship. These amendments find support on page 9, lines 15-17 and on page 10, lines 12-13 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 as presently amended is in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-18, which depend upon claim 1, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: October 6, 2003

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
508 Second Street, Suite 201  
Davis, CA 95616-4692  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665